Comparison of March Air Reserve Base and Hemet-Ryan Airbase, CDF Sacramento

Issue	March	Hemet-Ryan
Pilot and Aircraft Safety Issues		
Current Runway length	13,300 feet	4,315 feet
Class D controlled airspace	Yes	No
Have staffed control tower	Yes	No
Fully staffed Level A on site fire crash unit	Yes	No
Percent time under Visual Flight Rules (VFR)	Equal in 2004	Equal in 2004
Special Visual Flight Rules available	Yes	No
Runway width minimum of 100’	Yes	Yes
Runway suitable for S2T with safety over-run distance - 5,000’	Yes	No, only design drawing done
Runway suitable for all current Federal air tankers - 6,000’	Yes	No
Runway suitable for jet based fire fighting aircraft - possibly greater than 6,000’	Yes	No
Own land for 5,000’ runway	Yes	Yes
Own land for 6,000’ runway	Yes	Yes
Taxi ways capable of supporting single tire 60,000 lbs. and dual 130,000 lbs.	Yes	Yes
Probability of 2-3 minute delay due turbulence from non CDF large planes	Possibility with USAF non-training flights.	None
Co-located with current and future state-of-the-art federal communications links	Yes	No
Airport and Aircraft Security		
Parking and visitor access control	Yes	No
Dedicated full time airport security force	Yes	No
Fencing- 6’ minimum, 8’ new with barbed wire or razor wire	Yes	No
Minimum 3-foot candle power on ramp	Yes	No
Gated with electronic protection	Yes	No
Current Fire Protection Capability		
Can support continuation of 91-96% initial wildland fire attack success rate (Unit Fire Plan and CFES2 fire suppression simulations)	Yes	Yes

Issue	March	Hemet-Ryan
Can co-host CDF and USFS air tanker refueling for large joint missions	Yes	No
Provide full coverage of existing SRA lands not also within Ramona Air Base circle (Unit Fire Plan and fire history show that most big fires are to east of both sites)	Yes	Yes
Location vis a vis growing population in Wildand Urban Interface (WUI)	Closer	Farther to southeast
Location vis a vis areas with greatest burn frequency (Times burned graphic)	Equal	Equal
Location vis a vis Ignitions (Riverside 2005 Fire Plan)	Closer	Farther to southeast
Location vis a vis 2004 Initial attack success density (Riverside 2005 Fire Plan)	Closer	Farther to southeast
Location vis a vis 2004 Initial attack failure density (Riverside 2005 Fire Plan)	Farther	Closer. Failures are typically farther from engines, stations, roads, and houses
Future Fire Protection Capability		
Completed engineering plans for upgrade to at least a 6,000' runway (CDF and USFS air base standards to handle all air tankers used in the Western US)	Yes	No
Additional cost to complete full engineering plans (estimate)	$0	$1,429,000
Additional time to complete full engineering drawings (Hemet replacement schedule)	Exist, 2 months	48 months
State General Funds for airbase upgrade in current State budget - $8,296,000	Yes	No
Agreement for FAA funds to construct expanded runway	Not necessary	No
ESA habitat issues fully addressed under Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) and Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) completed for loss of habitat due to longer runway facility, any adjacent local roads, and any new buildings	Yes	No

Issue	March	Hemet-Ryan
Airport upgrade free of links to other state and local road infrastructure projects and possible habitat mitigation issues	Yes	No
Estimated time to complete ESA/RCIP/MSCHCP EIS necessary for new construction in MSHCP Conservation Area	None	SR 79 relocation EIS scheduled to be complete by 2009 (RCTC)
Have any required funding necessary for realigning any local roads (Warren and Stetson are slated for upgrade, realignment and improvement in Hemet City General Plan circulation element)	Yes	No
Provide full coverage of existing SRA lands not also covered by the Ramona Air Base 15 minute flight circle	Yes	Yes
Best case estimate of when construction could start after required environmental documents (ex. FAA and FWS compliant EIS/EIRs)	January 2006	2011 at the earliest
Other potential conflicts in use of air space or adjacent lands		
Absence of sailplanes and other small aircraft	Yes	No
Lack of expansion potential of recreation oriented aircraft use due to proximity to recreational areas	Yes	No
Lack of current residential areas immediately adjacent to runway	Yes	No
Lack of potential for new residential subdivisions within ½ mile of runways	Yes	No
Land use policies ensure existing air space and open space	Yes	No